

City of San José

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting

October 24, 2005

200 E. Santa Clara Street, Rooms W118-120

Task Force Members Present

Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales, Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Helen Chapman, Pat Dando, Russ Danielson, Craige Edgerton, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dan Hancock, Ken Saso, Steve Schott, Jr., Steve Speno, Neil Struthers, and Terry Watt.

Task Force Members Absent

Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Souza, Doreen Morgan, and Christopher Platten.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Dawn Cameron (County Roads), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Jane Mark (County Parks), David Bischoff (Consultant for City of Morgan Hill), Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Melissa Hippard (Sierra Club), Brenda Torres-Barreto (Audubon Society), Pat Sausedo (NAIOP), Tim Steele (Sobrato), and Kerry Williams (CHG).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Rachael Gibson (Supervisor Don Gage's Office), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Rabia Chaudhry (Council District 8), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Gerry DeGuzman (Public Works), Rebecca Flores (Housing), and Luke Vong (DOT).

Consultants Present

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Musbach (EPS), Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers), and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

Community Members Present

Pamela Arora, Brandon Au, Pete Bensen, Michael Bini, Craig Champion, Jill Clay Halloran, Roger Costa, Frank Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Juliana Chaw, Richard DeSmet, Robert Eltgroth, Jack Faraone, Steve Godwin, Barbra Goldstien, Janet Hebert, Liz Hirata, Mel Hirata, Virginia Holtz, Jack Hsu, Matt King, Jack Kuzia, Pat Kuzia, John Lattyak, Deborah Lohse, Peter Mandel, Dennis Martin, Sarah Muller, Ken Mikami, Wayne O'Connell, Kirsten Powell, George Reilly, Peter Rothschild, Art Sanchez, Annie Saso, Pauline Seebach, Sharon Simonson, George Thomas, Jr., and Shellé Thomas.

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. with Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone to the 37th Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of September 12, 2005 Task Force Meeting Summary

Mayor Gonzales called for a motion to accept the August 29, 2005 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Revision and Approval of Co-chairs' Draft Timing and Logistical Requirements

The Task Force discussed items 8 and 9 of Attachment II of the co-chair's Timing and Logistical Requirements memorandum. The purpose of this discussion was to finalize the Task Force's recommendations to the Council regarding items 8 and 9.

Item #8: Fair-share contributions to an assessment district must be structured so that they are weighted on the basis of acreage, NOT units or square feet produced. The goal is to use land in the most efficient way possible.

Jim Musbach, with Economic and Planning Systems, explained that the intent of item #8 is to ensure that high-density development is feasible. He indicated that this statement did not entirely capture the dynamics of the proposed financing plan regarding some critical elements that may be

required for an assessment district approach. Jim recommended that item #8 include language stating that cost allocations or cost burdens should reflect a nexus to the need for facilities.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding item #8:

- Will property owners who dedicate land for parks receive credit? *Jim responded in the affirmative. All property owners within the plan have an obligation to dedicate their fair share of public land. Property owners who dedicate more than their fair share will be compensated.*
- Recommended against using the word “nexus” because considerations may not necessarily be a strict nexus if development agreements are involved.
- Suggested rewording item #8 to say, “Contributions to an assessment district should be structured to the extent feasible so that they are weighted on the base of acreage, not units or square feet produced. The goal is to not unfairly or unduly burden or discourage higher density housing.”
- Should encourage efficient land uses. Contributions to an assessment district should be weighted on the basis of acreage and value in order to maximize bonding capacity.
- Weighting on the basis of value may help free up cost burdens for affordable housing.
- Would like this statement to include wording that does not discourage affordable housing.
- What would the assessment district cover? *Jim indicated that an assessment district probably would not be the primary financing mechanism used. The financing plan would include a combination of fees and financing districts. There would ultimately be a financing plan for all public facilities.*
- Recommended striking “contributions to an assessment district” and adding “cost burdens.”
- Should look at acreage, value, and use. The value of certain uses may change over time. Concerned that allocating cost strictly on demand would discourage more efficient land uses. *Jim indicated that they would determine cost allocations based on demand of a particular use.*
- In addition to weighting on the basis of acreage, value, and use, we should also look at benefits.
- The original statement included specific language. Concerned that changing the statement would modify the original intent. *Mayor Gonzales indicated that the revised statement has not changed the original intent. The Task Force has made the statement workable.*
- What is the City’s response to the proposed language? *Laurel stated that suggestions from the Task Force and consultants are broadening the statement to help create a flexible financing plan that will help achieve the statement’s original intent of encouraging efficient land use.*
- Concerned that our goals would not be achieved if we change “must” to “should.” *Laurel explained that in the City’s General Plan “should” is interpreted as “shall.”*
- Will the Council codify the items in Attachment II? *Laurel stated that the Council would make the final decision on all of these items.*

Task Force member Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins called for a motion to accept the following version of item #8, which was seconded by Task Force member Helen Chapman:

8. “Fair share cost burdens on an assessment district should be structured, to the extent feasible, so that they are weighted on the basis of acreage, use, benefits and value, not units or square feet produced. The goal is to use land in the most efficient way possible, and not to unduly or unfairly burden or discourage higher density housing or affordable.”

The Task Force approved the motion unanimously.

Item #9: Development may occur in ANY increment and in any location as long as it conforms to the Specific Plan’s land use and design guidelines.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding Item #9:

- Will the Specific Plan also include phasing objectives? *Co-chair Williams responded in the affirmative.*
- Should include language to ensure that development is consistent with the infrastructure plan.
- Residential development should be contiguous so that students are not bussed across Coyote Valley.
- How will this statement help create the envisioned balanced community? *Laurel explained that all nine items of Attachment II would work together to meet the goals of creating a balanced community, a greenbelt, and affordable housing.*
- Concerned that statement could be misinterpreted as allowing development to occur anywhere, in any place, and at anytime. Recommended revising the statement to say, “Development should occur in planned orderly manner and in conformance with specific plan land use, phasing, and design guidelines.”
- Does not think the Task Force needs to adopt this statement because by law, development must be consistent with the specific plan.
- Item #2 would be a more driving guideline than item #9. Suggested eliminating item #9. Recommended leaving it up to Council to decide whether there should be contiguous or noncontiguous development.

Phaedra called for a motion to eliminate item #9 from Attachment II, which was seconded by Task Force member Neil Struthers.

The public provided the following comments:

- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami family, indicated that it would be difficult to evaluate development criteria based on subjective concepts such as values and benefits.
- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, supported eliminating item #9. Allowing development to begin around the community core and lake would be better planning, allow coherent development, and maintain the viability of agricultural areas.

- Brenda Torres-Barreto, with the Santa Clara County chapter of the Audubon Society, stated that item #9 sends a wrong message.
- Consuelo Crosby, a South Coyote Valley Greenbelt property owner, stated that the Greenbelt should be addressed since it is part of the CVSP.

The Task Force approved the motion unanimously.

4. Discussion of Refinements to Proposed Schools and Parks

Doug Dahlin of Dahlin Group discussed the refinements to proposed schools and parks. The plan currently includes sites for nine elementary schools, two middle schools, and one or two high schools on a 60-acre collegiate-style campus. Each 9-acre elementary school site would include one additional acre for park use only. Each elementary school has a capacity of 600 students. The two middle schools are located along the Central Commons. An “academic street” is envisioned between the two proposed high schools. The middle schools and high school are all accessible by transit. Elementary schools are located in neighborhoods to facilitate walking to schools.

Doug provided an overview of the CVSP’s blue infrastructure, which includes hydrology and stormwater integration. Blue infrastructure consists of the lake, Fisher Creek, Coyote Creek, Laguna Seca, the urban canal, and bioswales. Doug also reviewed the plan’s green infrastructure, which includes parks and recreation. The green infrastructure consists of neighborhood parks, community parks, shared use school/neighborhood parks, dog parks, and recreational trails.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding schools and parks:

- Which school district is Coyote Valley in? *Doug stated that Coyote Valley is part of the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD).*
- How has this issue progressed? *Doug stated that the City and MHUSD have agreed on the student generation rates (SGRs). The Specific Plan originally proposed seven 800-student elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. The plan now includes nine 600-student elementary schools. The two middle schools have a capacity of 750 students and include 7-8 grades.*
- What is the projected population of the high school? *Doug stated that the high school campus would have a 3,000-student population for one or two schools.*
- Did the sub-committee decide on one or two high schools? *The Specific Plan proposes two high schools located on a single 60-acre campus. Since the high school would not have a 2,000-student population for 15 years, the District could have the option to locate the second high school at an alternative 30 to 40-acre site in the future.*
- What are the projected SGRs? *Task Force member Dan Hancock indicated that with 25,000 residential units, there would be about 10,000 students. The SGR would be about 0.4 students per residential unit. Doug explained that there are higher SGRs for stacked apartments with surface parking and affordable housing typologies. There are lower SGRs for townhouses and ownership condominiums.*

- As the CVSP moves forward, it may be necessary to re-evaluate the SGRs.
- Do the elementary schools have all-day joint uses? *The 10-acre elementary school sites include one acre for all-day park use. The remaining nine acres have joint use during after school hours. The middle schools would also have after school joint uses. The high school will not have joint uses.*
- It would take some time before student populations are large enough to justify opening schools. How will students get to school in the meantime? *Doug explained that there are enough students in the first phasing increment to open an elementary school. Middle schools would come on board after the first eight phasing increments. MHUSD indicated that 900 students are needed to open a high school. The high school would not come on board for about seven years.*
- Suggested that CVSP students could attend existing MHUSD schools in the interim until CVSP schools are phased in.
- How will the schools be financed? *Doug indicated that the schools would be financed by an assessment district. Jim explained that the District would try to get as much state funding as they can.*
- Would an assessment district also finance Gavilan College? *Doug stated that Gavilan College operates independent of the CVSP. Gavilan College is currently entering land negotiations.*
- Commended the school facilities sub-committee, MHUSD, and the CVSP team for their work. This issue has made a lot of progress.
- The Task Force should discuss the adequacy of the City's level of service (LOS) for parks, which requires 3.5 acres of parks per 1,000 population. Concerned that including acreage for shared use schools and parks in the level of service calculation would create a park deficiency. *Doug explained that the CVSP team has been working closely with the Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department. The Plan meets the city's LOS even though trails are not included in the calculations. With a cumulative total of 360 acres the plan exceeds the 245-acre LOS requirement for Coyote Valley.*
- The plan should include skate parks and dog parks.

The public provided the following comment:

- Kirsten Powell, representing the Morgan Hill Unified School District, stated that the District had been working closely with the City through the school facilities sub-committee. The District will take the proposed schools to the MHUSD Board for approval within one to two months. The District's existing middle schools and Sobrato High School may need to be expanded in order to accommodate CVSP students on an interim basis. The District would like to see the CVSP schools built as soon as possible.

5. Review Draft Specific Plan Table of Contents

Laurel provided an overview of the draft Specific Plan table of contents. The table of contents includes 12 chapters: plan overview; context; vision; major plan elements; urban design – key districts; land use; mobility; community land uses, facilities, and services; infrastructure; planning areas; greenbelt strategy; and implementation. Laurel noted that section 7.4 would be reorganized

to begin with rural streets to high volume. This would be in keeping with the spirit of the plan of getting people out of their cars.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding the CVSP table of contents:

- In section 12.2, does “project phasing” include development phases? *Laurel replied in the affirmative. “Project phasing” also includes infrastructure phasing.*
- Should include affordable housing in the table of contents.
- Should include information as to how decisions regarding schools were made.

The public provided the following comments:

- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, recommended including section 4.4.3 to discuss the jobs and housing balance in Coyote Valley, San Jose, and the Bay Area. He also recommended include section 1.3.5 to discuss the CVSP’s relationship to the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP). In addition to discussing the cross-valley wildlife connection in the Greenbelt, section 8.1.1.5 should also address the other wildlife connection located to North Coyote Valley, which is favored by the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami family, stated that the table of contents was a great outline. The east side of Monterey Road should be included in the early stages of development since Monterey Road is currently a high volume street.

Mayor Gonzales welcomed back former vice mayor Pat Dando to the Task Force. She previously left the Task Force in December 2004. Pat is currently the president and CEO of the San Jose/Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce.

6. Public Comments

- Richard DeSmet, a South Coyote Valley Greenbelt property owner, stated that while North and Mid-Coyote Valley have impressive plans, the Greenbelt still needs a strategy. In August 2004, Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning presented to the Task Force a self-sustaining plan for the Greenbelt. The plan included a clustered housing community. The plan also provides enough revenue to purchase the remaining Greenbelt and provides for public access and open space. Richard asked the Task Force to reconsider the organization’s self-sustaining Greenbelt plan.

7. Adjourn

Mayor Gonzales adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m. The next Task Force meeting will take place on November 14, 2005.

\\Pbce005\CoyoteValley_SpecificPlan\CVSP Mtgs_TASKFORCE\Meeting
Summary\TF_37_11.14.05\TaskForce_Meeting#37_10.24.05 Task Force Meeting.doc